

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE
AT KNOXVILLE

CHARLES E. JONES, JR.,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	3:24-CV-397-KAC-DCP
)	
CRANETECH, INC., et al.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER

Before the Court is (1) United States Magistrate Judge Debra C. Poplin’s “Order and Report and Recommendation” (the “Report”) [Doc. 12], which recommends that the Court dismiss Plaintiff Charles E. Jones, Jr.’s Complaint [See Doc. 12 at 6]; and (2) Plaintiff’s objections to the Report [Doc. 13]. Because the Order is not contrary to law, the Court (1) overrules Plaintiff’s objections; (2) accepts and adopts the Report; and (3) dismisses this action.

On September 23, 2024, Plaintiff filed a complaint against various Defendants, alleging “Invasion of privacy and Forced Labor and Servitude toilet porn slavery in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1584” [Doc. 1]. Subsequently, Plaintiff filed various supplemental materials, including additional factual allegations and dozens of supposed “stalking” videos, which include cars driving in traffic and planes flying overhead [See Docs. 5, 10, 11(manual thumbdrive on file with the Court)]. Plaintiff claims that various Defendants have installed “IP-based fiber optic camera equipment” in “every residence [he] ha[s] lived in the last 20 years” to stalk him and turn his homes into “cybersex dens,” among other similar allegations [See Doc. 1 at 8].

The Report recommends dismissing Plaintiff’s Complaint because the Complaint fails to state a plausible claim for relief under Section 1584 [See Doc. 12 at 4-5]. On March 25, 2025,

Plaintiff filed objections to the Report [Doc. 13]. Plaintiff appears to principally lodge a legal objection to the Report's conclusion that the Complaint, as supplemented, fails to state a plausible claim [See Doc. 13 at 1]. Plaintiff also appears to challenge the Report's assessment of the veracity of the Complaint's factual allegations [See Doc. 13 at 1-2]. He notes that he is "on disability" and has "been diagnosed with brain damage" [*Id.* at 4]. Even assuming all the facts in the Complaint as supplemented are true, it fails to state a claim for relief.


The Court must "modify or set aside any part of the order that is clearly erroneous or contrary to law." Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(a); *see also* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(A). This standard "provides considerable deference to the determinations of magistrate[]" judges. *In re Search Warrants Issued Aug. 29, 1994*, 889 F. Supp. 296, 298 (S.D. Ohio 1995) (internal citations omitted). The Court reviews legal conclusions de novo. *Bisig v. Time Warner Cable, Inc.*, 940 F.3d 205, 219 (6th Cir. 2019). A legal conclusion is contrary to law if "it fails to apply or misapplies relevant statutes, case law, or rules of procedure." *Bisig*, 940 F.3d at 219 (internal citations omitted).

Here, the Report did not err in concluding that the Complaint fails to state a plausible claim under 18 U.S.C. § 1584. Congress enacted Section 1584 to "enforce the Thirteenth Amendment." *Buchanan v. City of Bolivar*, 99 F.3d 1352, 1357 (6th Cir. 1996). Section 1584, however, "does not provide a private civil remedy" or imply a cause of action. *Id.*; *see also Smith v. Kentucky*, 36 F.4th 671, 674-75 (6th Cir. 2022).¹ This legal conclusion is

¹ In Plaintiff's objections, he references for the first time the Fourth Amendment to the United States Constitution and various Fourth Amendment precedents and doctrines [See Doc. 13 at 2-3]. To the extent Plaintiff intends to request leave to raise new Fourth Amendment claims, he fails to comply with the Court's Local Rules. *See* E.D. Tenn. L.R. 15.1. But even assuming any request was procedurally proper, it would still fail as a matter of law. Plaintiff has sued private individuals [See Docs. 1, 5, 10]. The Fourth Amendment, however, "restricts government, not private, action." *See, e.g., United States v. Miller*, 902 F.3d 412, 417 (6th Cir. 2020). As such,

accurate even if all of the facts in the Complaint, as supplemented, are viewed in Plaintiff's favor. Therefore, the Report is not contrary to law. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(A); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(a). Accordingly, the Court (1) **OVERRULES** Plaintiff's objections; (2) **ACCEPTS** and **ADOPTS** the Report; and (3) **DISMISSES** this action. An appropriate judgment shall enter.

SO ORDERED.


KATHERINE A. CRYTZER
United States District Judge

“[a] private party who searches a physical space,” without more, does not violate the Fourth Amendment. *Id.*